

20 SEP 1976

TAT MEMORANDUM FOR:

FROM

:

TAT SUBJECT

:

Paper on Sub-Career
Service for Agency RMO's

Chuck has written a well thought^{out} and realistic paper.
I have made some pencilled notations on the report itself
but would like to make the following more substantive
comments:

1. The DCI and certainly his predecessor have wanted Agency employees to think of themselves as belonging and contributing to the Agency's mission rather than owing loyalty to a very specific group.
2. The present system of career service emphasizes "belonging" not only to a specific directorate (therefore loyalty to that directorate first) but the sub career groups further serve to refine the feeling of "belonging" to an even smaller and very specific group within that directorate.
3. Present DCI policy is to improve Agency wide communications and emphasizes the need for cross training. Therefore, the establishment of yet another sub career group at ~~this time~~ would appear to be, if not in opposition to that policy, at least impede management's desire to develop and reward flexibility in its officers.

4. The point is made in paragraph 2 that the Agency's records management program is "decentralized" and that "RMO's are accountable only to their component supervisor". Only too true. Therefore, to develop a centralized program (whatever the subject) in a decentralized environment is a dichotomy which has long troubled Agency management, and has always affected, as a specific example, ISAS efforts to fulfill its Agency wide mission. A "directorate only" sub career group would result in varying approaches to records management and affect any attempt to develop an Agency wide program.

5. I believe this sub career service is only a part of the records management program and should be included (it probably has!) in the discussions with the IG group currently reviewing Agency records management. IG recommendations for an Agency-wide uniform approach to records management would be bound to result in a restructuring of the present system and should include consideration of career paths. An IG recommendation to manage records on a directorate wide basis would mean that DDA need concern itself only with developing career paths within the directorate and let the others do as they please.

6. It seems to me that the task at hand is to

first decide on the shape and form of the program

20 SEP 1975

and then resolve the career aspects.

7. One last comment - Can't we get rid of those "generalist" and "specialist" labels? They are divisive and the constant source of arguments. Aren't we all working in and for the DDA, if not for the Agency?



ST